

MC&G

*Check and destroy*

16 May 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DoD Medium-Scale Aeronautical Chart  
Conference

1. On 15 May I attended the first day of a two-day DoD conference on medium-scale charts at the ACIC installation (Cafritz Building) on Fern Street south of the Pentagon. One of the reasons for my attending was to hear the opening remarks by Lt. General Howard W. Penney, Director of the Defense Mapping Agency. General Penney stated that his management of DMA resources would be based upon two principles-- decentralization and responsiveness to users. He wants to keep his staff as small as possible and he will depend on the individual services for guidance. He also wants to ensure that map products are actually meeting user needs.

2. The General referred to a recently concluded (Confidential) Memorandum of Understanding between himself and General Bennett of DIA which differentiates the responsibilities of the two agencies in the MC&G field: DMA is to be the map program manager with responsibility for the fulfillment of operational requirements. DIA is responsible for policy control, adequacy, accuracy, and portrayal of the intelligence data on the map products.

3. There are two key questions in Penney's mind at the present time. What is the real requirement for the 1:250,000 (JOG-A and JOG-G) in the center of the "Soviet Bloc"? Is there a need for four types of 1:250,000 scale maps--the Air, Ground, and Radar versions of the JOG and the Intelligence Community's Special Intelligence Graphic?

25X1 4. Additional details on the DMA structure were then provided by [ ] the chairman of the conference. The DMA staff of 175-190 is expected to become operational 1 July 1972 in temporary quarters at the Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue. The Deputy is to be [ ] 25X1 USAF. The Director of one of the two major components-- specifically Plans, Requirements, and Advanced Technology--is to be a Navy Rear Admiral. A civilian GS-18 (according to other sources, [ ] of ACIC) will run the other major component-- Programs, Production, and Operations.

25X1 5. The remainder of the first day of the conference was focused on the Report on Results of the DoD Medium-Scale Aeronautical Chart Questionnaire. Despite numerous criticisms of details of the various medium-scale DoD products (1:250,000 and 1:200,000), the overall impression I got was that they are generally meeting user requirements.

6. Two major themes emerged in the subsequent discussion, one of which was the possibility of eliminating the Radar version of the JOG. The majority of the representatives from the various military services and commands, among which USEUCOM and Navy were the most vocal, took the position that the Radar version is not needed. It is a misnomer, designed in the days of high flying aircraft and is not very useful under the present operational concepts of flying at low levels, where even a "half-degree change" in approach angle changes the radar pattern. As a consequence, the commands use smaller-scale graphics such as the 1:500,000 Tactical Pilotage Chart for orientation and then have their radar predictors custom-tailor their operational radar graphics from photography and 1:50,000 topographic maps where they are available.

7. SAC was the lone--but still powerful--dissenter to this view. Their representative claimed that the Radar version was still useful to their operations. I could not discern any solid basis for this position--since the other representatives pointed out that SAC operations would also be low-level--other than that SAC has so many targets that any radar portrayal done by the

mappers and intelligence people would save them considerable manhours and thus keep them more current on urban built-up patterns.

8. Although the responses to the user questionnaire did not specifically suggest it, [ ] posed the question of combining the Air and Radar versions into one modified Air version. Such a procedure would have the added advantage of having one unclassified chart replace the current Unclassified Air and the Secret [ ] Radar JOG. There was considerable discussion whether such a move would be permitted by the current sanitization security guidelines. At one point when the discussion focused on replacing the current three-category system of radar patterns by a cartographic representation something like residential, light industrial, and heavy industrial, I ventured an opinion that such a representation would probably be permitted--provided that the proposal and the supporting argumentation were submitted to the appropriate security channels.

25X1

25X1

9. I subsequently learned that the DoD security people have been extremely negative to any such proposal. During the afternoon I had a personal conversation concerning this attitude with one of the chief DoD classification control spokesmen, [ ]. According to her, the rationale is that any such breakdown within urban areas would reveal sensitive sources. I indicated the inconsistency of this position by pointing out that for most Soviet and Chinese areas the mere existence of any detailed 1:250,000 maps at the unclassified level already goes this far.

25X1

10. At the conclusion of the day, I went to [ ] and stated that if DMA finally decided to eliminate the Radar version of the JOG, he should continue with the idea of working up a prototype of the modified Air version and submit it for security review. The inclusion of any annotations on targets and target aiming points would probably require a minimum of Confidential, but I felt that a simple three-category breakdown within urban areas stood a good chance of being approved at the Unclassified level.

11. A second major theme concerned the requirement for the Series 200 Charts (Scale: 1:200,000). SAC was alone in indicating a need for the series. Their claims that the charts provided "more detail, character, and plotting accuracy" were considered by every one else to be moot. There was agreement that a scale larger than the 1:200,000 is needed, but the requirement is on the order of 1:50,000.

12. The first day's discussion also included extended discussions of requirements on contour intervals, terrain portrayal, cultural features, place names, drainage, vegetation, military grid, and intelligence annotation formats (to be retained on the back of the chart or issued as a separate publication which could be updated at more frequent intervals by using computerized support from the DIA Automated Intelligence File?). These discussions will continue on the second day of the conference and should end up with recommendations for modifications in the production specifications.

#### Overall Impressions

13. In this early phase of DMA's existence the influence of three military services will continue to be strong. Installation names will change--e.g., the U. S. Army Topographic Command will become the Topographic Center, and the USAF and Navy cartographic facilities will become the Aerospace Center and Hydrographic Center, respectively--but the personnel and programs will probably be the same. Under budget pressure, General Penney may institute some changes, but they will come slowly, and only after attempting to get maximum concurrence from the individual services and commands.

14. The Memorandum of Understanding between DMA and DIA ensures sole DIA responsibility for intelligence inputs to the maps and charts produced for the various target material programs. In view of DIA's limited resources the agreement has the potential for developing some production bottlenecks, but these will probably be kept under control. A personal experience of

25X1 yesterday provides an example of how a routine procedure has become unduly complicated as a result of the Memorandum of Understanding. On 18 April, my previous role as TCO/OBGI required me to initiate a request to DIA for authority to release several Series 200 Controlled Dissem charts to a FMSAC contractor studying Soviet missile operations. Such a simple request normally should have been processed in a matter of days. Yesterday when I asked [ ] about the status of my request, she told me that she now has to get the concurrence of both the Director, DIA, and the Director, DMA. At the present time she has a backlog of over 80 charts that are awaiting DIA approval. I indicated that such extensive delays would have to be cut down by additional "understandings" because they handicapped essential (CIA) operations. Also, I have the impression that DoD personnel are sometimes unduly hampering essential DoD operations on matters relating to the sanitization of COMIREX sources.

25X1 15. Pressure is increasing somewhat within DoD against the Series 200 Charts. Designed in the early days of the Cold War to facilitate SAC bomber operations, they have become increasingly obsolete as a general purpose intelligence map. According to [ ] this conference will not result in any decision to drop either the Series 200 or the Radar version of the JOG, but both of these products will be subjected to intensive review.

16. The requirements for large-scale topographic maps, and the source materials from which they can be compiled, are becoming more important to the military services--not for traditional artillery uses, but to support low-flying operations.

Miscellaneous

25X1 17. My conversation with [ ] had one additional benefit. She told me about the publication that they use to determine which U. S. areas are sensitive for radar map portrayal (and presumably also for overhead photography). It has a title something like the Consolidated Classification List. The last edition, which was published by the USAF about 18 months ago, is shorter than

previous editions. According to her, the most important sensitive areas are the AEC installations. I am arranging to get a copy to build up our background knowledge concerning criteria for judging the sensitivity of NASA photography of the U.S. areas.

25X1A

